

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 6, 16, 19, 22 and 28 have been amended. The application continues to include claims 1-33. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

The Claims Comply with the Written Description Requirement

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, the claims have been amended and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Claims are Allowable over the Prior Art because the Prior Art fails to Disclose the Generation of a Web Page Using a Master Specification with a Common Style, and a Subordinate Specification with a Subordinate Style

Claims 1-23, 26-29, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ferrel et al. (U.S. 5,860,073, "Ferrel"). Claims 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, in view of Keating (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0052895). Claims 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel, in view of Lie et al., "*Cascading Style Sheets, level 1*" ("Lie"). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because the prior art fails to disclose the generation of a web page using a master specification with a common style, and a subordinate specification with a subordinate style.

One embodiment is a method and system that provides a common design for a

web site or a web based application that includes multiple related web pages. *See* U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0138516 (the publication no. of the present application), ¶¶2 and 7. A master specification 202 is generated that includes a common style, navigation arrangement and/or content placement for the web pages. *See id.*, ¶ 22. A subordinate web page specification 204/206 is generated for each web page of the web site and includes content for the web pages. *See id.*, ¶ 27.

Master specification 202 includes <head> section 212 which includes a style specification and/or navigation specification for the common design of the web pages. *See id.*, ¶ 23. However, “each subordinate web page specification 204/206 may specify additional controls in <head> section 222”. *See id.*, ¶ 24. The controls include style elements. *See, e.g., id.* at ¶ 6. When generating a web page, a “generator 240 merges the additional control information specified in <head> section 222 of subordinate web page specification 204 into the adopted <head> section (block 304)”. *See id.*, ¶ 29. Therefore, style from the subordinate web page is merged with common style from the master specification.

Ferrel discloses style sheets for a publishing system. A “story object” makes reference to a style sheet 443 before being rendered on page 434. Ferrel, col. 19, ll. 36-38. The style sheet includes formatting information, including “properties of the paragraphs, fonts and embedded objects in the story that format the content as it was originally designed. Ferrel, col. 19, 39-44. However, Ferrel fails to disclose any element that can be considered a “subordinate content specification” that would include a “first subordinate style”. For example, Ferrel discloses that “[i]t is important to note that each of these story objects makes reference to the style sheet 443 before being

rendered on the page 434.” Ferrel, col. 19, ll. 37-40. In fact, Ferrel teaches away from including style/formatting content in the story boards:

Due to the **separation of design and content** in the MP system, the story objects themselves only have formatting tags, but do not contain a description of the particular format that corresponds to each tag. The descriptions of those tags is found in the style sheet that is linked to the control into which the story object becomes rendered.

Ferrel, col. 19, ll. 44, 50 (emphasis added). The remaining prior art also fails to disclose having style content in a subordinate content specification in addition to a master specification.

In contrast to the cited prior art, amended independent claim 1 recites a “first subordinate style” and a resultant web page that includes “a first merged style that comprises the first subordinate style merged into the common style”. For at least these reasons, amended claim 1, and amended claims 6, 16, 19, 22 and 28, which recite similar limitations, should now be allowable over the cited prior art. The remaining claims depend from either claim 1, 6, 16, 19, 22 and 28, and should also be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

No fee should be required for this submission. However, should any fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 15, 2009

/Barry S. Goldsmith/
Barry S. Goldsmith
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,690

Customer No. 74739
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7876
Fax: 703-720-7802

BSG:sjm